

**MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (MOA)**  
**BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, XVIII AIRBORNE CORPS AND**  
**FORT BRAGG AND THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION**  
**OFFICE REGARDING RECOVERY OF SIGNIFICANT INFORMATION FROM**  
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES 31CD1008 AND 31CD1035, FORT BRAGG, NORTH**  
**CAROLINA**

WHEREAS, the Department of the Army, XVIII Airborne Corps and Fort Bragg (Fort Bragg), plans to construct new facilities, including an Ammunition Supply Point and the All American Freeway extension (Undertaking) to accommodate significant future growth, including the addition of units and command headquarters; and

WHEREAS, Fort Bragg, in consultation with the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), pursuant to 36 CFR 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA [16 U.S.C. 470f]), has determined that the Undertaking will result in adverse effects to archaeological sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035, both of which are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 36 CFR 800.6 (a) (1), Fort Bragg notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) of the determination of adverse effect and invited the Council to participate in consultation to resolve the adverse effect; and

WHEREAS, in response to Fort Bragg's notification and invitation, the Council declined/agreed to participate (Attachment A); and

WHEREAS, Fort Bragg, in accordance with the NHPA, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA [25 U.S.C. 3001]), and other federal laws, Executive Orders, and DoD Policy has and continues to consult with Federally recognized American Indian nations who may attach religious or cultural significance to historic properties on Fort Bragg (List of Nations at Attachment B) ; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 36 CFR 800.3(f)(2), the nations listed at Attachment B were provided an opportunity to comment on the determination of adverse effect and the content of this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA); and

WHEREAS, to fulfill requirements of 36 CFR 800.6(a)(4) and 36 CFR 800.11(f), public involvement was solicited by public announcement in local newspapers, by placing a draft copy of this MOA in local public libraries and via Internet posting; and

WHEREAS, public comments are addressed at [TBD]; and

WHEREAS, Fort Bragg acknowledges and accepts the advice and conditions outlined in the Council's "Recommended Approach for Consultation on the Recovery of Significant Information from Archaeological Sites", published in the Federal Register on June 17, 1999;

NOW, THEREFORE, Fort Bragg and the SHPO agree that the Undertaking shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account and mitigate the adverse effects of the Undertaking on sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035.

## STIPULATIONS:

Fort Bragg shall ensure that the following stipulations are implemented:

1. Mitigation of Adverse Effects to Archaeological Sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035.

a. Data Recovery Plan. Fort Bragg shall ensure that the Data Recovery Plan (DRP) at Attachment C is fully executed in order to obtain a significant, scientific sample of information from archaeological sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035.

b. Inadvertent Discovery

(1) No human remains or associated funerary objects, as defined in the NAGPRA, are expected to be encountered in archaeological data recovery;

(2) In the event of inadvertent discovery of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects during the archaeological investigations for this MOA, Fort Bragg will follow the procedures outlined in Attachment D;

c. Confidentiality.

(1) All signatories acknowledge that the public release of site location information for archaeological sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035 may result in harm to these sites.

(2) Section 9(a) of the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA [16 USC 470hh(a)]) and 36 CFR 800.11(c) prohibit the disclosure of such data.

d. Curation. Fort Bragg shall ensure that all materials and records resulting from the data recovery are curated in accordance with 36 CFR 79.

e. Milestones. Fort Bragg shall ensure that the following milestones are met.

(1) Fieldwork conducted in accordance with the DRP will begin within 30 days of and will be completed within six (6) months of the signature of this MOA except that, Fort Bragg may not begin fieldwork until funding is made available, and may complete Work beyond six months if reasonable delay is occasioned by Act of God or force majeure. And, any such delay shall not constitute failure to perform in accordance with the DRP.

(2) Within 60 days of the completion of fieldwork, Fort Bragg will submit a Management Summary to the SHPO summarizing the results of the field investigations. Fort Bragg shall ensure that the Management Summary will contain sufficient information to demonstrate that the field investigation portion of the DRP has been completed.

(3) Upon receipt of the Management Summary the SHPO will have 45 days to review and comment on the information contained within the document.

(4) Upon receipt of SHPO comments on the Management Summary, Fort Bragg will consider the field investigations completed and Fort Bragg may proceed with the Undertaking, including construction in the site areas.

(5) A draft report will be prepared as provided for in the DRP and submitted to the SHPO within 36 months of the signature of this MOA. The SHPO will have 60 days to review and comment on the draft report. Fort Bragg may assume SHPO concurrence with the Management Summary (4) and draft report if comments are not received within the allotted period of review.

(6) A final report will be completed as provided for in the DRP and submitted to the SHPO within 90 days after receipt of SHPO comments on the draft.

## 2. Administrative Stipulations

a. Definition of signatories. For the purposes of this MOA the term “signatories” means Fort Bragg and the SHPO, each of which has authority under 36 CFR 800.6(c)(8) to terminate the consultation process.

b. Professional supervision. Fort Bragg shall ensure that all activities regarding archaeology carried out pursuant to this MOA are carried out by or under the direct supervision of a person or persons meeting at a minimum the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards for Archaeology (36 CFR 61).

c. Alterations to project documents. Fort Bragg shall not implement any action that is inconsistent with or beyond the parameters of this MOA, including the attached DRP, without first affording the signatories to this MOA the opportunity to review the proposed change and determine whether it shall require that this MOA be amended. If one or more such signatories determines that an amendment is needed, the signatories to this MOA shall consult in accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(c)(7) to consider such an amendment.

### d. Dispute Resolution

(1) Should any signatory to this MOA object to any action proposed by or carried out by Fort Bragg with respect to the implementation of this MOA, Fort Bragg shall consult with the objecting signatory to resolve the objection. If after initiating such consultation, Fort Bragg determines that the objection cannot be resolved through consultation, Fort Bragg shall forward all documentation relevant to the objection to the Council. Within 30 days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the Council shall exercise one of the following options:

(a) Advise Fort Bragg that the Council concurs with Fort Bragg’s proposed final decision, whereupon Fort Bragg will respond to the objection accordingly;

(b) Provide Fort Bragg with recommendations, which Fort Bragg shall take into account in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection; or

(c) Notify Fort Bragg that the objection will be referred for comment pursuant to 36 CFR 800.7(c), and proceed to refer the objection and comment. The resulting comment shall be taken into account by Fort Bragg in accordance with 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4) and § 110(l) of NHPA.

(2) Should the Council not exercise one of the above options within 30 days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, Fort Bragg may assume the Council's concurrence in its proposed response to the objection.

(3) Fort Bragg shall take into account any Council recommendation or comment provided in accordance with this stipulation with reference only to the subject of the objection; Fort Bragg responsibility to carry out all actions under this MOA that are not the subjects of the objection shall remain unchanged.

e. Anti-Deficiency Act Compliance. The stipulations of this agreement are subject to the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act. If sufficient funds are not made available to fully execute this agreement, Fort Bragg will consult with the signatories to this MOA to either terminate or amend the MOA in accordance with the amendment and termination procedures found at 2g. and 2h. of this agreement.

f. Duration. This agreement is in effect beginning with the last dated signature and continuing until all milestones are completed, per Section 1d. In the event the milestones are not accomplished within five years, the signatories will enter into negotiations for a new MOA.

g. Amendment. Any signatory to this MOA may propose that the MOA be amended, whereupon, the signatories shall consult to consider such amendment(s). 36 CFR 800.13 shall govern the execution of the amendment.

h. Termination.

(1) If Fort Bragg determines that it cannot implement the terms of this MOA, or if the SHPO determines that the MOA is not being properly implemented, Fort Bragg or the SHPO may propose to the other signatory that this MOA be terminated.

(2) The signatory proposing to terminate this MOA shall so notify all signatories to this MOA, explaining the reasons for termination and affording them thirty (30) days to consult and seek alternatives to termination.

(3) Should such consultation fail, Fort Bragg or the SHPO may terminate the MOA. Should the MOA be terminated, Fort Bragg shall either:

(a) Consult in accordance with 36 CFR 800.6 to develop a new MOA; or

(b) Request the comments of the Council pursuant to 36 CFR 800.7.

i. Filing. A signed copy of this MOA will be filed with the Council in accordance with 36 CFR 800.6.

Execution of this MOA by Fort Bragg and the SHPO, and implementation of its terms, evidences that Fort Bragg has afforded the Council a reasonable opportunity to comment on the adverse effects of new construction on archaeological sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035 and that Fort Bragg has taken into account the effects of its undertaking on these archaeological sites. Execution and compliance with this MOA fulfills Fort Bragg's responsibilities for this undertaking under Section 106 of the NHPA.

**AGREED:**

**FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA**

\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_  
David G. Fox  
Colonel, Special Forces  
Fort Bragg

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER**

\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_  
Dr. Jeffrey Crow, Director  
North Carolina Division of Archives and History  
State Historic Preservation Officer

**FILED BY:**

**ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**CONSULTATION WITH ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

\*IN PROGRESS\*

DRAFT

## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **AMERICAN INDIAN NATIONS CONSULTING WITH FORT BRAGG**

Absentee Shawnee Tribe  
Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town  
Catawba Indian Nation  
Cherokee Nation  
Chickasaw Nation  
Muscogee Creek Nation  
Shawnee Tribe  
Thlopthlocco Tribal Town  
Tuscarora Nation  
United Keetowah Band

## ATTACHMENT C

### **DATA RECOVERY PLAN FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES 31CD1008 AND 31CD1035, FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA**

#### I. INTRODUCTION

This data recovery plan specifies measures to recover significant information from archaeological sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035, located at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035 are both eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and will be impacted by planned construction of new infrastructure and specialized facilities at Fort Bragg. These data recovery excavations are designed to mitigate the adverse effects to these sites pursuant to consultation conducted by Fort Bragg and the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The overall goal of this Data Recovery Plan is to establish the parameters and direction of scientific investigation of the two sites in question. This plan begins with a brief summary of the project setting and proceeds with a declaration of general and specific research problems that can potentially be addressed using data from sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035. Field and lab methods intended to produce data and analytical results relevant to these research problems are outlined. Subsequent sections detail the reporting and curation requirements. Procedures to be followed in the case of an inadvertent discovery of human remains are outlined in a separate appendix (Attachment D).

#### II. PROJECT SETTING AND SITE DESCRIPTIONS

Archaeological sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035 are located at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, in the Sandhills physiographic region of the interior Coastal Plain, near the city of Fayetteville. The Sandhills region is distinctively characterized by low-nutrient, deep sandy soils, an erosional, hilly landscape and a longleaf pine wiregrass and scrub oak forest.

Site 31CD1008 is located near a modern man-made pond (adapted from a historic millpond) on Fort Bragg in the upper Tank Creek drainage. Situated on a low toe ridge between two second order streams, the site is located in the urbanized cantonment area of the installation. While surrounded by modern development, the site is fairly intact with only isolated ground disturbance from previous military excavations, unimproved road use and erosion. The site is roughly 300m<sup>2</sup> in size. The artifact assemblage from previous survey (Grunden and Ruggiero 2006) and testing (McNutt and Gray 2007) includes primarily metavolcanic and quartz debitage and pottery. A limited number of stone tools and a small amount of animal bone were recovered as well. At least three types of pottery have been identified at 31CD1008 (Hanover, New River, Cape Fear), with at least six pots present. After excavation of close-interval shovel tests and test units, McNutt and Gray (2007) found evidence of spatially segregated pre-contact occupations with some vertical differentiation of lithic and ceramic deposits, though the latter were unusually deep in some areas of the site.

Site 31CD1035 is a small site situated along a gentle slope adjacent to a seepage spring north of the Lower Little River in Fort Bragg's Northern Training Area. The site is characterized by a



dense concentration of lithic debitage and an unusually high frequency of tools with two raw materials predominant in the assemblage. Close interval shovel testing confirmed the small site size and tightly concentrated horizontal nature of the deposits (Gray 2007). The site is estimated at approximately 160m in size, based on the distribution of artifacts. A single prehistoric occupation and possibly one episode of stone tool production, maintenance and utilization is evidenced by the discrete concentration of lithic reduction debris and tools. Although a clearly diagnostic hafted biface is lacking, the primary occupation is suspected to date to the Paleoindian period. A possible second component was indicated by the presence of a few quartz flakes in Phase I and II excavations. So few quartz flakes exist that this component is not considered significant. Previous test unit results indicate the single component of interest exists primarily within 20 to 60 cm below surface in a soil package that includes a gravel deposit.

### III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A considerable amount of archaeological work conducted at Fort Bragg through cultural resources management investigations serves as a significant body of research to aid in determining the most effective methods that can be utilized to recover significant information from the sites described above. For the Pre-Contact era, extending from the Paleoindian period to the Late Woodland period, the archaeology of Fort Bragg and the Sandhills in general has revealed a pattern of ephemeral sites dispersed across an interriverine landscape with a limited range of variation in the types of artifacts and features present. These sites seem to reflect a persistent element of logistical and/or residential mobility in cultural adaptations over several millennia. While there is redundancy and simplicity in the archaeological record, there is clearly considerable research value in these resources. Increasingly the importance of Sandhills archaeology is being recognized for informing chronological models of culture history, piecing together aspects of archaeological cultures, and constructing settlement models (Cable and Cantley 2005; Cable et al. 2005; Espenshade 2008; Herbert et al. 2002; Herbert and McReynolds 2008; McNutt 2008; Patch 2008; Steponaitis et al. 2006).

One of the most important concepts to be applied when working with Pre-Contact archaeology in the Sandhills is a focus on individual components within sites. A component is identified as a spatially discrete artifact concentration reflecting temporally isolated, individual occupations or activities. Similar to a non-site or landscape approach, the archaeology of the Sandhills is best recognized as the archaeology of hunters and gatherers whose cultures were based on some combination of hunting, collecting and foraging for a range of resources over large geographic areas. It is generally recognized by researchers that utilization of the Sandhills constituted one component of human ecology at any given point in the Pre-Contact era. While sites are important constructs for resource management by government agencies, the scientific interpretation of Pre-Contact cultures in the Sandhills will ultimately be based on individual components more than the arbitrarily defined concentration of artifacts on a particular landform, i.e. a site. Because most Sandhills sites represent episodic use of landforms at different points in time, components, to include specialized activities limited in time, short-term campsites, etc., are best identified through intensive sampling at the site or landform level with equal weight attached to horizontal and vertical discrimination of deposits.

The following research questions have been developed to guide investigations at sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035. These questions focus on gaining an understanding of the chronology and spatial organization of selected components at each site in question. The recovery of information targets components and/or activities previously identified in Phase I and II investigations. The planned data recovery is intended to enhance the current understanding of Pre-Contact cultures in the

North Carolina Sandhills region and adjacent areas. While some of the discussion below relates to mitigation and sampling of sites, the primary behavioral unit of analysis is the component.

*Site 31CD1008*

1. Can the multiple apparent artifact concentrations revealed in Phase II testing be further delineated and interpreted as individual components? The delineation of artifact concentrations must control for horizontal and vertical distributions. Interpretation of vertically discrete artifact concentrations and/or features will be evaluated based on diagnostic artifacts as well as distinctive lithic raw materials. In addition, these interpretations will be compared with geoarchaeological investigations to detect the possibility of living surfaces correlated with artifact concentrations.
2. Assuming the site contains Archaic period components, as indicated in the Phase II testing, what kinds of lithic technology are evident for individual time periods represented (e.g., Early, Middle or Late Archaic)? What types of lithic tools were being produced, maintained, and/or utilized? How do these tools compare to other known assemblages in North Carolina? What inferences can be made about subsistence economies based on the tools being produced and/or used?
3. Assuming the site contains Woodland period components, what lithic tools are associated with these occupations and what activities are indicated? How do these tools/activities compare to other Woodland sites in North Carolina? Are these tools and activities related to the use of pottery spatially?
4. For any and all components identified, is the distribution of artifacts and/or features indicative of site function and/or occupation duration? Can a hearth and/or domestic structure be identified or inferred? If so, can these features be dated through radiocarbon or luminescence dating? How do these distributions compare with models of hunter-gather site organization discussed by Cable and Cantley (2005), Cable et al. (2005), and McNutt (2008) for sites in the North Carolina Sandhills and elsewhere?
5. How do patterns of lithic and/or clay raw material procurement and use relate to subsistence economy and mobility? Can geochemistry and other techniques be applied to assist in sourcing analysis? What does the compositional variation of stone indicate about procurement for different site components? What does the composition of ceramic paste in sherds indicate about procurement of clay and direction of movement for Woodland period groups represented?
6. How many Woodland period pots are associated with a particular occupation? How old are these pots and what functions did they serve?
7. How were the archaeological deposits at the site buried? What postdepositional processes have affected the observed patterns of artifact distribution? Do artifact distributions represent primary deposition?
8. Since the Sandhills area is suspected to be an area only temporarily occupied by hunter gatherers, can any evidence be derived from the site that would allow inference of the season of occupation and/or the composition of the immediate environment?

#### *Site 31CD1035*

1. Is the site a single component as inferred in Phase II testing? Does this site represent a Paleoindian occupation?
2. What types of lithic technology are evidenced? How does this toolkit compare to other known assemblages of comparable age in the Southeastern United States and elsewhere (e.g. Collins 2007; Daniel et al. 2007)? What inferences can be made about subsistence economy and settlement based on the toolkit present, e.g., for Clovis age cultures, does this Paleoindian assemblage support a big-game hunter or more diversified adaptation (Grayson and Meltzer 2002)? What are the implications for prevailing models of selective raw material use, tool curation and long distance mobility range of Paleoindian period cultures (Bamforth 2002; Goodyear 1989)?
3. How does the type of lithic raw material and its utilization at the site relate to mobility range and the organization of technology? Can we determine the source of metavolcanic stone through sourcing analysis (e.g. Steponaitis et al. 2006)? What is the composition and possible origin of the apparent metasandstone material included in the assemblage and what technological advantage did it offer?
4. What types of activities are evidenced and what is the spatial distribution of activities at 31CD1035? How do these distributions compare with other Paleoindian sites? Can a hearth and/or domestic structure be identified or inferred?
5. Drawing on models for Paleoindian settlement systems, how would this site relate to a broader settlement pattern?
6. How were the archaeological deposits at the site buried? What postdepositional processes have affected the observed artifact distribution patterns? Can sediment and/or carbon samples be dated in order to determine the age of the component?
7. Can any evidence be derived from the site that would allow inference of the season of occupation and/or the composition of the immediate environment?

#### IV. FIELD METHODS

*Background Research.* The work will begin with background research concerning previous archaeological studies of similar cultures in the Coastal Plain of North Carolina and in the surrounding region. Recent testing level and data recovery of sandy soil sites with Archaic and Woodland components similar to those expected at 31CD1008 will be reviewed. For the Paleoindian component at 31CD1035, research regarding Paleoindian sites will be reviewed, including sites in other regions of North America. Background research will include examination of technical reports and other materials on file at the Office of State Archaeology as well as published journal articles, academic press publications, and dissertations/theses. In addition to literature review, coordination with researchers who are familiar with the cultures under study and methods employed in similar geomorphic and taphonomic situations may be conducted to assist in preparation for fieldwork.

For geoarchaeological research and specialized artifact analyses outlined below, consultant analysts expected to perform these specialized roles will be identified and consulted prior to fieldwork. In coordination with these consultants guidelines will be developed for all soil

samples and any necessary excavation, recordation or sampling techniques associated with anticipated analysis for soil chemistry, sediment analysis, luminescence dating, phytolith analysis, etc. A sampling strategy will be created, incorporating enough flexibility to allow decisions for final analyses to be based on available funds, number and quality of components identified, etc. Provisions may be made for independent analysis for certain studies in order to evaluate the reliability of results. In particular, the application of absolute dating techniques for ceramics and the evaluation of taphonomic conditions at either site may be targeted for independent study by separate consultants and/or labs.

*Field Methods.* The following field methods are planned for the data recovery excavations. These methods build on those currently used to investigate other pre-contact sites in the Sandhills (e.g., Abbott 2005; Cable and Cantley 2005; Cable et al. 2005; McNutt and Gray 2007). These methods also build on the previous work conducted at each site, targeting areas of interest identified and sampled in testing. The components identified in previous investigations are the primary research targets. Identification of additional components is not the objective of this research, though additional components may be encountered and will be thoroughly documented in accordance with the methods described below. The progress of fieldwork will be coordinated with the Fort Bragg Cultural Resources Management Program (CRMP) to ensure all aspects of this MOA are adequately executed and considered.

*Site Relocation and Establishment of a Grid Provenience.* Work at each site will begin with relocation of the survey monuments associated with mapping data points utilized in Phase II testing. A grid will be created at each site, utilizing the Phase II grid origin coordinates and azimuth for grid layout, effectively re-establishing the Phase II grid. Gridpoints will be established on the ground using total station surveying techniques or similarly accurate method. These grid points will serve as reference points for all excavations (blocks, shovel tests and/or test units).

*Block Excavations.* The majority of excavation shall be in the form of carefully controlled, systematically excavated blocks that target components identified in the Phase II testing. Block excavations must include enough area around high-density artifact concentrations to reasonably define the spatial limit of those concentrations. Where necessary, shovel tests may be used in lieu of block expansion (see below). The maximum area of horizontal provenience within a block must be 1x1 m, with selected areas excavated using .50x.50 m cells where refined spatial control is required to delineate artifact distributions.

At 31CD1008, block excavations will be excavated to investigate at least three artifact concentrations evidenced at the Phase II level. At 31CD1035, the single, primary component will be investigated with a block. In addition to encompassing artifact concentrations, blocks will also explore some of the relatively low density areas surrounding a concentration, which could be the location of features related to structures, domestic space or other activity areas.

While block placement will be based on artifact concentrations, soil chemistry samples will be selectively taken prior to excavation. Soil chemistry results may be used to direct a limited portion of block excavation provided the area of interest is in relative proximity to artifacts and components being identified. Exploration of chemistry results may result in block expansion or placement of a small block in a particular site area.

Block excavations shall be controlled using arbitrary levels with natural soil strata separated within those levels. In order to assess vertical displacement and/or burial of artifacts relative to the modern ground surface and to provide data comparable to other regional excavations,

arbitrary levels below a datum with a known elevation must be utilized. Excavation records will allow measurement of the depth of artifacts below the modern ground surface. Individual arbitrary levels will be no greater than 10 cm in thickness, with 5 cm levels applied where appropriate to refine measurement of the vertical distribution of artifacts. Block excavations will extend to at least one sterile 10 cm level below the known artifact distribution at each site with at least some 1x1 m units, including those along walls selected for profiles, extending into a B horizon. In Phase II test unit excavations at 31CD1008 and 31CD1035, the maximum depth of artifacts typically occurred between 50 to 60 cm and 70 to 80 cm below ground surface, respectively. Deeper deposits may be explored for purposes of investigating the potential for deeply buried artifacts and/or geomorphology. Temporally diagnostic artifacts, tools and any artifacts and features thought to be associated with a previous living surface, e.g., a rock hearth or pit feature, will be piece plotted.

For block excavations, soil column profiles will be drawn to scale to sufficiently illustrate and delineate the natural and cultural structure of the landforms and the depositional contexts of artifacts. Detailed profiles will be drawn for at least two walls of each block excavated. These profiles will be interpreted archaeologically in reference to the vertical distribution of artifacts and in terms of site formation processes. Archaeological soil profiles will be drawn, labeled and interpreted in such a way as to facilitate comparison with geoarchaeological results.

At site 31CD1035 a single prehistoric occupation is evidenced by a discrete concentration of lithic reduction debris and tools. Since the component of interest has been delineated in previous shovel testing, a single large block will be excavated in the area of the identified lithic concentration and activity area. This block will include a minimum area of 100 m<sup>2</sup>. The exact configuration or dimensions of the block can be adjusted to trace artifact and/or feature distributions.

At site 31CD1008, evidence of multiple pre-contact components was identified in close-interval shovel testing at the Phase II level. Lithic reduction areas and pottery concentrations are distinguishable horizontally and vertically on a discrete landform. At site 31CD1008 block excavations must cover a minimum of 175 m<sup>2</sup>. Separate blocks shall be placed within the site, each targeting areas where discrete components were identified in Phase II testing. Block placement will be based on existing shovel test and test unit data. Individual blocks must be large enough to encompass individual activity areas or discarded artifact clusters, e.g., ≥ 5-x-5 m. The exact configuration or dimensions of individual blocks can be adjusted to trace artifact and/or feature distributions.

*Feature Recordation and Excavation.* All possible cultural features (rock clusters, pits, etc.) will be flagged when first exposed and given a unique number for subsequent tracking purposes. Features will then be mapped, drawn and photographed, and excavated separately from the surrounding matrix.

Standardized techniques will be used to record and excavate features, although these may vary depending on feature size and apparent type. Initially, each feature will be carefully defined by troweling or shovel shaving and mapped in plan view. Photographs will be taken of the feature in plan. Each feature will be cross-sectioned along its long axis. The initial half will be excavated by natural strata (fill zones) if these can easily be recognized, or removed in a single unit if not. The feature will then be mapped and photographed in profile, and the remainder of the fill will be excavated by natural strata or fill zones. If at any time a feature is determined to be noncultural in origin (e.g., rodent burrow, tree root), excavation will be terminated. Because features are rare in the Sandhills, all feature fill will be taken as flotation samples. Botanical remains will be



extracted from the flotation process and selected samples will be subjected to ethnobotanical analysis and Accelerated Mass Spectrometry (AMS) dating.

All information generated from feature excavation will be recorded on a feature form. Standard soil descriptions will be completed for each fill zone, and data will be recorded concerning feature dimensions, evidence of burning, disturbance, artifact content, etc.

*Recordation and Mapping Procedures.* During the fieldwork, a field log (journal, notebook) will be maintained detailing the daily tasking, findings, observations, impressions, and all information related to data recovery excavations. The daily sequence and progress of excavations, site mapping and grid creation, units opened and completed, significant findings, and decisions regarding the course of fieldwork will be recorded in this log. Printed forms will be used to record the various kinds of data obtained (i.e., photo logs, shovel test forms, level data forms, artifact bag lists, etc.). Feature forms will be used to record all information related to the identification, excavation and initial interpretations of individual features. Unit level forms will be maintained for each arbitrary level of each 1x1 m cell within blocks. These level forms will require each excavator to record the opening and closing elevations of each level, the artifacts recovered as well as observations on the soil, any features present and any notable relationships between individual levels and other adjacent areas studied. The Munsell Soil Color Chart shall be used to describe soil strata and colors. All cultural or natural features and other relevant phenomena will be included in soil profile drawings. The field log and excavation forms will link observations to the appropriate map or form containing additional or supporting information. The log together with all field forms and maps shall become a part of the permanent project records and will be included in the material submitted to and curated by Fort Bragg.

Detailed maps will be produced for each site adequately depicting all relevant natural/cultural landscape features. Site maps will be created with the following features clearly identified and accurately located: topography (with contour lines), artificial features and evidence of modern or historic ground disturbance (excavations, roads, etc.), vegetation (trees, shrubs, grasses), erosion, archaeological grid and excavations, geoarchaeological samples locations, and artifact spatial proveniences. All draft and final report maps will include legends, scales, and north arrows. At least one map shall include the location of all survey monuments illustrated in the context of the site grid.

Original field maps will be included with field notes and other records transferred to Fort Bragg for curation at the conclusion of the project. Field map data will be integrated into formal, professionally drawn maps to be accurately prepared and incorporated in project draft and final reports. Maps must accurately reflect site conditions, including environmental landscape features, to include natural and artificial elements (topography, roads, vegetation, hydrology, etc.) and all archaeological work at the site.

*Shovel Tests.* No minimum number of shovel tests is required for this project, however shovel tests may be placed around block excavations to assist in the interpretation of the spatial limits of artifact concentrations and to complement the shovel testing data generated in the Phase II. If shovel tests are excavated, the dimensions, depth and recordation of those shovel tests will correspond to the Phase II methods used at the site. Shovel test logs will be maintained providing information on the grid provenience, size, depth, soil conditions, and contents of all collection/shovel test units. The location, depth, and associated materials for all shovel tests will be noted in the project report appendix for both positive and negative tests. The artifact contents of all positive shovel tests will be explicitly documented in the report appendix. Soil horizons

and strata notes for all shovel tests opened during boundary definition fieldwork will be described in standard scientific terms in field, as well as incorporated in a project report appendix.

*Photography.* Sufficient digital and 35mm photographs will be taken to document significant data and information found during the survey work. The following aspects of the sites and investigations should be well-documented with photography: block excavation levels (representative sample of cleaned level floors, both sterile and artifact-bearing, from each block), block excavation soil profiles, all piece plotted artifacts, all features, site landscape (including panoramic view of sites, capturing landform). Block excavation, soil profiles and feature photographs will contain an appropriate (and legible) scale, north arrow and menu/information board, which identifies the site, provenience, date, and subject. Soil profiles from blocks will be photographed directly at the elevation of the profile wall, with multiple digital images stitched together to accurately record the wall profile. Menu boards will be clearly located in the photographs, but placed so as not to detract from a clear rendering of the subject. Additional photographs of the subject may be taken without the information board, although the scale and directional indicator will be retained.

Photo logs will be maintained and minimally contain the following information: roll number (which must be a unique number), name of archaeologist, direction of view, subject matter, and date. All photo prints (contact sheet prints accepted) and slides will contain the above information on each individual photo and/or slide.

*Absolute Dating and Geoarchaeological Investigations.* In the Sandhills, the scarcity of traditional archaeological features and organic material in clear association with artifacts complicates the absolute dating of archaeological deposits. However, given the finality and destructive nature of data recovery excavations, it is important to collect and attempt the analysis of multiple lines of evidence that may inform the age of the deposits at both sites and the natural and artificial processes contributing to the burial of deposits.

While typically occurring in small quantities and from multiple sources, carbon is present in Sandhills soil columns and should be dated whenever its association with artifact concentrations and/or features can be discerned. Carbon samples will be collected where such samples are noted during excavation, particularly from artifact bearing soil zones and within or around features. Carbon samples will be extracted directly from excavations and from controlled levels where artifacts occur and/or flotation.

In addition to radiocarbon dating, other dating techniques will be applied where appropriate. For ceramics, thermoluminescence (TL) will be considered for application to individual artifacts as an important dating technique. In addition to TL, ceramics may be subjected to a process where carbon is extracted from the crushed sherd and dated using Accelerated Mass Spectrometry (AMS). For features such as oxidized sand hearths, which have been noted on some Woodland sites (Cable 2008; Patch 2008), luminescence dating may be considered for the altered sediments within the feature matrix.

At both sites 31CD1008 and 31CD1035, specialized study of soil, sediment and pollen or phytolith samples may be relevant for research questions related to taphonomy and seasonality of occupation. Considerable geoarchaeological work on sandy soil sites in the Sandhills has been accomplished (Benson 2000; Abbott 2005; Seramur and Cowan 2003; Cable and Seramur 2008). Primary taphonomical issues of interest include bioturbation and sedimentation. The contribution of these processes to the burial and potential separation or preservation of individual component assemblages can add important context to the interpretation of site formation and the integrity of

individual activity areas. For this data recovery investigation a geoarchaeologist and possibly other specialists with experience in sandy soil, coastal environments of the southeastern United States will be brought into the project as a consultant. The geoarchaeologist will analyze soil, sediment, and landform characteristics in order to interpret the depositional history of the landform and the processes affecting the burial of the artifacts at each site. The geoarchaeologist will employ sediment grain analysis and other techniques as necessary to interpret the site's formation history before and since artifacts were deposited.

Luminescence dating, including Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) and Infrared Stimulated Luminescence (IRSL) of sand deposits at both sites will be employed to determine the age of sediments, to analyze the potential for buried living surfaces, and to assess the effects of sedimentation and pedoturbation or bioturbation at each site.

In addition to sediment analysis, the study of phytoliths has been applied in the Sandhills and may be employed as well to inform the interpretation of site formation and taphonomy. Of particular interest is the presence of phytoliths as an indicator of buried living surfaces. Also of interest is the potential for seasonality.

Finally, soil chemistry analysis will be considered for application at each site. Soil phosphate analysis can be an important indicator of anthrosols, i.e. soils impacted by past human activities (Petersen and Mohler 2002). Phosphorous may be measured with vertical control and compared to artifact frequencies to evaluate the presence of buried living surfaces. It may also be used in the analysis of horizontal site structure to aid in the identification of domestic spaces. The latter application met with some recent success at a Late Woodland site on Fort Bragg (Patch 2008) and may be most relevant at site 31CD1008 for the purposes of this project.

## V. LABORATORY ANALYSIS, REPORTING, AND CURATION

All cultural materials discovered during the course of the project are to be included in the project collections analyzed for reporting and final curation. All artifacts collected will be systematically sorted, identified and analyzed using procedures or processes appropriate to the type or class of artifact under consideration. The analytical methods and procedures used for each type or class of artifact and the results of the analysis will be presented in the final report of investigations. The majority of artifacts will be lithic or ceramic, for which specific analytical requirements are outlined below. A primary emphasis of the laboratory analysis and reporting will be the determination of occupation span, and range of activities for each component studied at both sites.

Lithic artifacts, including debitage, cores, and tools will be rigorously analyzed based on morphological and technological attributes indicative of tool manufacturing, maintenance and/or core reduction techniques, tool function and use life. Raw material will be carefully assessed for all lithic artifacts. Projectile points will be classified typologically to assist chronological determinations. The differentiation of lithic raw material based on macroscopic attributes is critical at multi-component hunter-gatherer sites for discerning individual occupations and activity areas. With debitage and tool concentrations, variation in vertical and horizontal contexts is an important means of identifying separate cores, blanks, or tools carried onto or utilized at a site. Attributes to be identified, especially for metavolcanic stone, include groundmass (texture and color); phenocrysts; flow banding; patination; fracture properties. For quartz, some characterization of variability will be considered as a measure of raw material quality and possibility source area. Raw material is also considered an important measure of settlement organization and mobility (Steponaitis et al. 2006).



All ceramics will be analyzed to permit identification of key attributes relevant to current research topics in Sandhills archaeology. Of particular concern for identifying pottery in a manner that facilitates placement into a regional cultural-historical model, is the composition of paste, including natural and/or cultural inclusions (i.e., temper) and the nature of surface treatment. An archaeologist familiar with pre-contact pottery from the Coastal Plain of North Carolina will identify paste, temper, surface treatment and assign the pottery to established typological categories, including pottery series and type. A minimum number of individual (MNV) vessels will be estimated for each site and each such vessel described. Vessel-level attributes, profile, lip treatment, rim form, will be addressed for each pot identified.

A geologist familiar with the geologic resources of central and eastern North Carolina and experience in the analysis of pre-contact ceramics, will be consulted to identify a representative sample of paste characteristics (see Herbert and McReynolds 2008). An analysis of the number and variety of vessels present will be completed. Conjoinability of sherds will be established to evaluate horizontal and vertical displacement. A sample of sherds will be submitted for special analysis of absorbed pottery residue (e.g., Reber and Evershed 2004). Pre-contact period sherds will be inspected for carbon residue prior to cleaning for possible radiocarbon dating.

The various aspects of ceramic analysis will be used to inform interpretation of the site on several levels. Typological analysis will inform discussion of chronological periods represented at the site and a site structure model of individual components. Conjoinability of sherds across areas of the site, along with similar of pottery attributes and absolute dating will be used to assess the possible contemporaneity of pottery types and Woodland occupations.

All cultural material obtained during the field research, including artifacts, faunal and flora remains, soil and other samples, etc., will be cleaned, stabilized when necessary (including metal stabilization where appropriate for unusual or especially significant historic artifacts). All material will be clearly labeled, using a permanent medium and prepared for permanent curation in archival bags.

All intact or potentially diagnostic projectile points, significant stone or bone tools, representative examples of ceramic types and vessels, and all unusual or especially diagnostic artifacts will be illustrated using photographs (with scale) in the final report.

For each site, artifact density/distribution maps using the Phase II shovel test data and any additional shovel tests excavated during data recovery, will be produced to guide the interpretation of materials obtained from the block excavations, and these maps will be presented in the final report in a legible format. These maps may be produced using a standard computer mapping program such as Surfer, Symap, MacGridzo, or their equivalent. The method by which the maps were produced will be documented (i.e. the program, interpolative algorithm, scale/contour intervals must be referenced).

An interpretive section will be prepared as part of the report, separate from the management recommendations, which summarizes what was found and evaluates what has been learned from the project. Quantitative and qualitative comparative analyses with site data previously recorded on Fort Bragg and elsewhere will be conducted as part of this effort.

*State Site Forms.* The work at each site will be recorded on North Carolina site forms on acid free paper. Site forms will be filed with the North Carolina Office of State Archaeology and Fort Bragg. Electronic forms will be provided to allow integration of information into a database.

*Management Summary.* In accordance with the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement, a management summary briefly describing the work conducted and the results of excavations will be completed at the conclusion of fieldwork.

*Artifact Catalog/Inventory.* An artifact inventory with each artifact cataloged by specific provenience and accession number will be produced as an appendix for the draft and final report. This inventory will record all attribute data recorded in artifact analysis. It will be included as a curation deliverable and will be made available in digital format for analysis and integration into a database. Care will be taken to ensure that artifact counts are fully reported and that data tables add up correctly. Data values reported for site dimensions, numbers of tests, and artifact counts in the report text, on maps, and other figures, and in the inventory/appendices will be consistent, and in agreement with what is reported on state site forms.

*Report.* A detailed, comprehensive technical report will be prepared at the conclusion of this data recovery project. To be completed in accordance with the MOA milestones, this report will include the following major components:

- Literature review to place research methods and interpretation of artifacts in appropriate regional and cultural context.
- Detailed summary of field and laboratory methods, with clear reference to the research design and explication of how methods employed were designed to address these questions.
- Detailed analysis of site structure, including the identification of individual components based on vertical and horizontal artifact distributions.
- Description and quantification of all artifacts by raw material, functional, and typological categories.
- A summary of all geoarchaeological and site formation analyses.
- Overall interpretation of each site and discussion of the components identified within a regional context of settlement, subsistence economy, and cultural affiliations.

*Curation.* All project artifacts, field records, analysis notes and documentation, photographs, electronic media, and other data will be prepared for permanent curation at Fort Bragg. Preparation will be accomplished in accordance with the Fort Bragg Curation Guidelines (2002), the North Carolina Office of State Archaeology standards, and 36 CFR 79, Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections.

## VI. PUBLIC HISTORY

To ensure that information derived from the research outlined here will be accessible for the general public, consistent with the spirit of the NHPA, an interpretive summary of the artifacts recovered and the cultures represented will be prepared and disseminated. Through multiple media formats, e.g., internet, cd-rom, written publication, or some combination of these media, artifacts will be illustrated, identified and interpreted in a cultural context for the Pre-Contact era. Furthermore, the process of archaeological investigation will be featured as the methods used to discover the past will be highlighted. At site 31CD1008, an opportunity may be created for members of the Fort Bragg area community to witness and participate, on a limited basis, in the archaeological investigation. Attempts to involve the public will address confidentiality concerns in the MOA.

## VII. INADVERTENT DISCOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS

If Native American human remains, burial items, or objects of cultural patrimony are discovered during the course of this project, Fort Bragg will be notified immediately. All work must stop in any area producing the human remains or items until proper consultation can occur by Fort Bragg and installation personnel. All coordination with and reporting to Native American groups with potential interest in NAGPRA related cultural resources identified at Fort Bragg shall be conducted by Fort Bragg. Work will not resume on a site containing human remains, burial items, or objects of cultural patrimony until authorized by Fort Bragg after consultation with American Indian nations.

## VIII. SOURCES CITED

Abbot, L.E.

- 2005 *Archaeological Data Recovery at Site 31HT435: Upland Site Structure in the Sandhills Region of North Carolina, Harnett County, North Carolina*. Report submitted to North Carolina Department of Transportation, Project Development and Environmental Analysis, Raleigh, North Carolina. Report prepared by New South Associates, Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Bamforth, D.B.

- 2002 High Tech Foragers? Folsom and Later Paleoindian Technology on the Great Plains. *Journal of World Prehistory* 16(1):55-98.

Benson, R.W.

- 2000 *Phase II Evaluation of 50 Potentially Eligible Archeological Sites in the Overhills Tract, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, Volume I*. Report submitted to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District, Savannah, Georgia. Report prepared by Southeastern Archeological Services, Inc., Athens, Georgia and Gulf South Research Corporation (GSRC), Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Cable, J.S. and C.E. Cantley

- 2005 *Prehistoric Occupation Types in the North Carolina Sandhills: Phase II Archaeological Testing and Evaluation of Eight Prehistoric Sites in Harnett, Hoke and Moore Counties*. Report submitted to National Park Service, Southeast Archaeological Center, Tallahassee, Florida and Department of the Army XVIII ABN Corps and Fort Bragg, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Report prepared by Palmetto Research Institute, Irmo, South Carolina.

Cable, J.S., C.E. Cantley and D.E. Port

- 2005 *Phase II Archaeological Testing and Evaluations of Thirteen Sites, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, Volume 1: Nine Prehistoric Sites*. Report submitted to National Park Service, Southeast Archaeological Center, Tallahassee, Florida and Department of the Army XVIII ABN Corps and Fort Bragg, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Report prepared by Palmetto Research Institute, Irmo, South Carolina.

Cable, J.S. and K.Seramur

- 2008 *Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery of 31HT690: A Long Reoccupied Hunter-Gatherer Location in the North Carolina Sandhills*. Report submitted to National Park Service, Southeast Archaeological Center, Tallahassee, Florida and

Department of the Army XVIII ABN Corps and Fort Bragg, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Report prepared by Palmetto Research Institute, Irmo, South Carolina.

Collins, M.B.

- 2007 Discerning Clovis Subsistence from Stone Artifacts and Site Distributions on the Southern Plains Periphery. In *Foragers of the Terminal Pleistocene in North America*, edited by Renee B. Walker and Boyce N. Driscoll, pp. 59-87, University of Nebraska Press.

Daniel, R., Jr., W.H. Moore and J. Pritchard

- 2007 Analysis of a Paleoindian Stone Tool Assemblage from the Pasquotank Site (31PK1) in Northeastern North Carolina. *Southeastern Archaeology* 26(1), Summer 2007.

Espenshade, C.

- 2008 *The Importance of Vessel-Based Analysis in the Sand Hills of North Carolina*. Southeastern Archaeological Conference, November 2008.

Goodyear, A.

- 1989 A Hypothesis for the Use of Cryptocrystalline Raw Materials Among Paleoindian Groups of North America. In Ellis, C., and Lothrop, J. (eds.), *Eastern Paleoindian Lithic Resource Use*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, pp.1-9.

Gray, J.W.

- 2007 *Phase II Testing of Four Sites (31CD1030, 31CD1031, 31CD1035, 31CD1064), Fort Bragg, Cumberland County, North Carolina*. Report submitted to Engineer Research and Development Center, Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, Champaign, Illinois. Report prepared by TRC Garrow Associates, Inc., Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Grayson, D. K. and D. J. Meltzer

- 2002 Clovis Hunting and Large mammal Extinction: A Critical Review of the Evidence. *Journal of World Prehistory*, Volume 16, Number 4. Springer, Netherlands.

Grunden, R. and D. Ruggiero

- 2006 *Phase I Archaeological Reconnaissance of 8559 Acres (3463 Hectares) at Fort Bragg and Camp Mackall, Cumberland, Hoke, Richmond and Scotland Counties, North Carolina*. TRC Garrow Associates, Inc., Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Report submitted to National Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia. Report prepared by TRC Garrow Associates Inc., Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Gunn, J.D. and I. Rovner

- 2003 Horses Grazing: Point Function and Shape, *North Carolina Archeology* Vol. 52, pp. 53-100.

Herbert, J.M., J.K. Feathers, A.S. Cordell

- 2002 Building Ceramic Technologies with Thermoluminescence Dating: A Case Study from the Carolina Sandhills. *Southeastern Archaeology* 21(1):92-108.

Herbert, J.M. and T. E. McReynolds

- 2008     *Woodland Pottery Sourcing in the Carolina Sandhills*. Report submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development Center, Construction Engineering Research Laboratory. Report prepared by Cultural Resources Management Program, Fort Bragg and the Research Laboratories of Archaeology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- McNutt, C. H. Jr. and J.W. Gray  
2007     *Phase II Testing of Twenty-Four Sites, Cumberland, Hoke, and Richmond Counties, Fort Bragg, North Carolina*. Draft report submitted to Engineer Research and Development Center, Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, Champaign, Illinois. Report Prepared by TRC Environmental Corporation, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- McNutt, C. H., Jr.  
2008     *Phase II Testing of Six Sites (31HK206, 31HK207, 31HK221, 31HK1686, 31HK1690, and 31HK1694), Fort Bragg, Hoke County, North Carolina*. Report submitted to National Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia. Report prepared by TRC Garrow Associates, Inc., Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- Patch, S.  
2008     *Artifact Clusters, Features, and Prehistoric Site Structure in the North Carolina Sandhills*. Southeastern Archaeological Conference. November 2008.
- Petersen, S. C. and P. J. Mohler  
2002     *The Archaeology of Sandy Soil Sites: A New Approach to the Field Valuation of Site Integrity*. North Carolina Archaeology, Volume 51, p.98.
- Reber, E.A. and R. P. Evershed  
2004     Identification of Maize in Absorbed Organic Residue: A Cautionary Tale. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 31(4):399-410.
- Seramur, K.C. and E.A. Cowan  
2003     Site Formation Processes of Buried Cultural Horizons in the Sandhills of North Carolina: An Example from the Horses Grazing Site (31MR205), *North Carolina Archaeology* Vol. 52, pp. 101-118.
- Steponaitis, V.P., J.D. Irwin, T.E. McReynolds, and C.R. Moore  
2006     *Stone Quarries and Sourcing in the Carolina Slate Belt*. Research Report No. 25, Research Laboratories of Archaeology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Waguespack, N.M. and T.A. Surovell  
2003     Clovis Hunting Strategies, or How to Make Out on Plentiful Resources. *American Antiquity* 68(2):333-352.

## **ATTACHMENT D**

### **INADVERTENT DISCOVERY OF NATIVE AMERICAN HUMAN REMAINS AND ASSOCIATED FUNERARY OBJECTS**

[Reference: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act 25 USC 3002, Sec. 3(d), 43 CFR 10.4]

1. Upon the definite or suspected inadvertent discovery of human remains and any associated funerary objects during investigations at 31CD1008 and/or 31CD1035, the supervisory field archaeologist will stop all work in the area of discovery at the site, to include at least a 50m<sup>2</sup> area, and notify the Fort Bragg Cultural Resources Manager and/or his designee by telephone. Fort Bragg shall provide contact information to all field crew personnel prior to the initiation of fieldwork.
2. When notified of the possible inadvertent discovery of buried human remains and/or funerary objects, the Cultural Resources Manager and/or his designee will arrange to visit the site within twenty-four (24) hours of the discovery, to determine if the remains are (1) associated with a recent crime scene and (2) if not, whether the remains are likely or possibly of Native American descent.
3. If, upon examination, the remains appear to be human and associated with a crime scene of 50 years old or less, the Cultural Resources Manager will notify appropriate law enforcement officials, all activities will cease at the site, and the immediate discovery area will be protected and declared off limits to everyone except personnel authorized by Fort Bragg.
4. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Cultural Resources Manager must make a written field evaluation of the circumstances of the discovery, the condition and contents of the burial, including any artifacts, the primary context of the remains and/or funerary objects, and their antiquity and significance. The human remains and funerary objects will be evaluated in situ. The Cultural Resources Manager may consult with a qualified physical or forensic anthropologist, if necessary.<sup>i</sup> The immediate area where the human remains or funerary objects are discovered will be protected, stabilized and covered.
5. Following confirmation of the presence of Native American remains, the Cultural Resources Manager will immediately notify the Installation Commander or his/her official designee by telephone. This telephone notification will be followed immediately by a written notification that contains the results of the field evaluation and a plan of action to inform the commander of the required consultation pursuant to NAGPRA and 43 CFR 10. Written notification will be submitted to the Commander within 48 hours of the initial discovery.
6. No later than 48 hours after receipt of written confirmation from the Cultural Resources Manager, the Installation Commander or his/her official designee will forward to the Cultural Resources Manager certification that the notification was received.
7. Within 24 hours of receipt of notification by the Installation Commander, the Cultural Resources Manager shall notify all nations listed in Attachment B by telephone,



electronic mail, and facsimile if appropriate. This notification shall include the field evaluation. Notices shall be sent directly to designated NAGPRA coordinators, Tribal Historic Preservation Coordinators, and/or other Points of Contact identified in previous consultation between Fort Bragg and any given nation.

8. With the notification described above, Fort Bragg will request consultation regarding the treatment and disposition of human remains and/or funerary objects. Consultation will be conducted in accordance with 43 CFR 10.4. The human remains and/or funerary objects shall be protected and undisturbed until consultation is completed.

---

<sup>i</sup> In the event that consultation with a physical or forensic anthropologist is required to confirm the identity of ancient human remains, the notification procedures outlined will proceed as outlined, with information from expert analysis included in notification and consultation as soon as it is available.